

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein. Claims 7-10 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added as a result of the Claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

The present office action states that Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claims 1 and 11, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is overcome.

Regarding Claims 3-6 and 12-20, Claims 3-6 and 12-20 introduce no new problems. Therefore, since the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph is overcome, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 3-6 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20

The present office action states that Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinman et al. (6625035) (hereinafter Steinman) in view of Liu (6511139). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 are not unpatentable over Steinman in view of Liu for the following rationale.

Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 and 11 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the currently amended feature:

“a first printed circuit board having a first functionality, said first printed circuit board coupled to a pair of card guides;

a second printed circuit board having a second functionality, said second printed circuit board coupled to said pair of card guides.”

Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 6 lines 19-22 and 13 lines 5-7 and Figure 1A. (Claim 11 includes similar features.)

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (MPEP 2143.03).

Applicants have reviewed Steinman and do not understand Steinman to teach or render obvious the feature of the first printed circuit board coupled to a pair of card guides and the second printed circuit board coupled to the same pair of card guides.

On page 3 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has stated that the first printed circuit board (802) is coupled to a pair of guides (810 and a middle guide as shown in Figure 8). However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion.

Specifically, the Applicant points out that in Figure 8 of Steinman, the first printed circuit board 802 is coupled with guide 810 and 808. Moreover, the second board (804) cited by the examiner is coupled with guide 810 and a middle guide. Thus, Applicant does not understand Steinman to teach the first printed circuit board and the second printed circuit board to be coupled to the same pair of card guides (emphasis added).

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Liu does not overcome the shortcomings of Steinman. That is, Applicant does not understand Liu to teach or render obvious the features of a first printed circuit board having a first functionality, the first printed circuit board coupled to a pair of card guides; a second printed circuit board having a second functionality, the second printed circuit board coupled to the pair of card guides.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claims 1 and 11 are not taught or rendered obvious over Steinman in view of Liu and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as they overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Furthermore, regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the feature “wherein said modular configuration enables replacement of either said first printed circuit board or said second printed circuit board from said pair of card guides without requiring the removal of the other of said first printed circuit board or said second printed circuit board from said pair of card guides.” Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 6 lines 22-26, page 12 lines 16-18 and page 13 lines 7-8. (Claim 11 includes similar features.)

Applicants have reviewed Steinman and do not understand Steinman to anticipate the currently amended feature wherein the modular configuration enables replacement of either the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides without requiring the removal of the other of the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Liu does not overcome the shortcomings of Steinman. That is, Applicant does not understand Liu to teach

or render obvious the features of the modular configuration enables replacement of either the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides without requiring the removal of the other of the first printed circuit board or the second printed circuit board from the pair of card guides.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claims 1 and 11 are not taught or rendered obvious over Steinman in view of Liu and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as they overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With respect to Claims 3-6, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 3-6 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and that Claims 12-20 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 11 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 3-6 and 12-20 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.


CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-6 and 11-20 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 2/26/07



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 938-9060